



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/601,729	06/23/2003	Tom Sprinkle	12873/04605	8729
24024	7590	07/22/2009		
CALFEE HALTER & GRISWOLD, LLP			EXAMINER	
800 SUPERIOR AVENUE			OSTRUP, CLINTON T	
SUITE 1400				
CLEVELAND, OH 44114			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3771	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/22/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ipdocket@calfee.com
dcuin@calfee.com

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/601,729	SPRINKLE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	CLINTON OSTRUP	3771

All Participants:

Status of Application: Amended

(1) CLINTON OSTRUP. (3) ____.

(2) KENNETH SMITH. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 8 July 2009

Time: PM

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Possible 103 rejections based on the newly amended claims.

Claims discussed:

1, 3, 4, 30, 33, and 35.

Prior art documents discussed:

Raje et al., (6,823,869) & Scarberry et al. (2002/0100479)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Clinton Ostrup/
 Examiner, Art Unit 3771
 /Justine Yu/
 Supervisory Patent Examiner

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted Mr. Smith and informed him that he was trying to get the application in condition for allowance and suggested incorporating the limitation of claim 3 into that of claims 1, 33 and 35. Mr. Smith agreed to incorporate the material of claim 3 into claim 1. Mr. Smith argued that claim 33 already had "a retaining ring permanently secured to the shell inside said side wall by sleeves that are heat staked on posts" which distinguished it from the prior art of record. The examiner agreed that the limitation in claim 33 was sufficiently different from the prior art and made claim 33 allowable over the prior art of record. Mr. Smith then argued that by adding this limitation to claim 35, claim 35 should then be allowable over the prior art. The examiner agreed and it was mutually agreed that the amendment would be done by Examiner's Amendment. The dependency of claim 30 was also changed to depend directly from claim 1, as claim 3, from which claim 30 depends would be cancelled.